

An ad was carried by local news outlets in Challis, Salmon, and Clayton, about upcoming hearings on allowing 129,000 pound trucks to be permitted for US93 and SH75. The following is being offered as testimony regarding the applications.

Emails:

Specific Route: US-93 MP 244.33 to MP 350.82

Comments: A part of this road is considered a Blue route. I has some very sharp turns that many accidents have occurred at. The road is barely adequate for a standard vehicle, if one slows down appropriately, even though the agency considers the off track limits ok, practically, it doesn't happen. I strongly suggest this permit not be approved.

Jane McCoy
Received 12/21/2019 11:35 AM

- - -

Specific Route: SH 75 from milepost 219.5 to mp 244.33

Comments: I have been driving this road for over 40 years and my observations do not coincide with the theoretical analysis of "off track". Multiple times while driving this road I have observed trucks coming around a curve in the oncoming lane. The length of the truck was just too much for the drivers to keep in their lane, although some charts say it is theoretically possible, the practical application does not apply in so many cases. I have also been run off the road by one of these large trucks, barely missing the river. I did report this to the authorities but it is not wise to be looking for a license plate number while trying to avoid a collision with obstacles beyond the roadbed. Also, Table 1, US 93 Geometry is used in evaluating SH-75. They are not the same roads and the Right Paved Shoulder with of the stated 2-3' is not consisted with Hwy 75 mp 219.5-244.33 I recommend that this proposal not be approved.

Jane McCoy
Received 12/21/2019 11:28AM

- - -

Specific Route: Clayton, ID to Lost Trail Pass

Comments: This is my second comment on the proposed application to approve use of 129,000 pound truck traffic along this route. I oppose this size and weight of truck because of safety concerns (lack of turnouts for passing; travel through the downtown area of Challis and Salmon; travel along school bus pickup/drop off areas). I also oppose an application for a single user that appears to have no sunset date or assurance the road will only be used for molybdenum transport from the mine in Clayton. It is unclear whether the proposed use is temporary or permanent. I definitely oppose permanently establishing this route as a double-truck through-haul route! What might be on the route next... double cattle trucks, double UPS trucks, double oil trucks? It is out of character for this recreation use, rural area to become a through-haul truck route. Please do not approve this application. Or, if it is approved based on a preponderance of comments in favor, please add a sunset clause and clarify that the use is for the molybdenum mining applicant only.

Evalyn Bennett
Received 12/21/2019 9:27AM

- - -

Dear Mr Green,

We are writing in opposition to granting a permit to Lott Trucking to operate oversized loads via Highway 93, a Scenic Byway along the Salmon River continuing over Lost Trail Pass to Montana.

Points of opposition include:

1. When Monida pass on interstate 15 is closed due to weather, Lost Trail Pass on U.S. 93 would be an even less appropriate route, being steeper and narrower, few passing lanes, sharp curves and fewer snow removal resources.
2. Making Highway 93 a reasonable alternative would require construction of frequent passing lanes, runaway truck escape lanes, a bypass route around the city of Salmon. Appropriate improvements on 93 for some 30 miles south of Salmon adjacent to the Salmon River would be close to impossible and certainly outrageously expensive.
3. Tandem trucks of these weight lack the maneuverability and especially stopping power to safely operate on road such as Highway 93 and should be, in the interest of public safety, be restricted to interstate or four lane Highway's whenever possible. To do otherwise constitutes an avoidable and unacceptable public risk.

The short notice of the comment meeting and brief comment deadline might elicit suspicion of motives of the IDT to minimize negative reaction to the proposal.

In conversations with other local citizens I find then unanimously opposed to this permit. It is my hope that the IDT will do the right thing and refuse the lot trucking permit and any similar future applications.

Sincerely,
Gordon Lucas
RuthCampbell
Received 12/22/2019 10:36PM

- - -

Lance ,
Please DO NOT Allow Expanded Truck & Trailer use on Hwy 93.
Many Thanks
Wil Wilkins
PO Box 14
North Fork ,ID. 83466
Received 12/21/2019 9:22PM

- - -

Dear Lance,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed alternate truck route along Highway 93 and 75. I strongly urge the ITD to NOT ALLOW the increased truck/trailer weight along these routes as I do not feel they bring benefit, and may actually further burden our already financially strapped, rural communities. I also do not feel this proposal aligns with our rural values for the following reasons:

1) Safety for our children, tourists, hunters and fisherman, cyclists, and for our wildlife. This route is used by all these folks daily and with tourist and recreational traffic increasing substantially during summer. Many of these folks are going slow, pulling in and out of turn-outs with trailers, and conditions are particularly challenging when the road is covered with snow and ice or falling rocks. Adding heavier trucks to this mix is a bad idea as I have already experienced almost being back-ended and run over by one of these large trucks along Highway 75. Our wildlife are also at great risk with too many being killed along these routes. These are highly valued state resources that should not be placed at increased risk, particularly as these species concentrate on winter range at lower elevations.

2) This route is a Wild and Scenic Highway and is really not appropriate for the heavy truck traffic that we already experience. There are numerous accidents along the windy road and at least one of these trucks has gone into the river in the past.

3). The Salmon River is an iconic river supporting many fish species that are highly valued Nationally. We cannot afford to place these species, or our water, at greater risk.

4) Wear and tear on our city and county roads cost our already strapped counties since my understanding is that there is no additional fees to cover these costs that are part of this proposal.

In the future, I would ask that the State of Idaho change its evaluation process to include a cost/benefit analysis that assesses safety and infrastructure impacts so that cities, counties, and taxpayers have a better foundation for considering these types of proposal.

Please help us retain our rural values, keep our children safe, and not place increased burden on our already strapped counties. Please do not permit this increased truck weight on this route.

Thank you,

Toni Ruth
PO Box 172
Carmen, Idaho 83467
Received 12/21/2019 5:25PM

- - -

Hi Lance,

A friend of mine brought this issue to my attention. These comments are written by my friend but I completely concur. And would vote NO on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,

Will

Received 12/21/2019 11:41 AM

- - -

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why:

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- I have lived in both Salmon and Challis with occasional commuting in between the two locations. Even in the comparatively few trips that I made between the two locations on US 93 for the comparatively short amount of time I lived in either place, I saw multiple accidents and often when conditions were fine--A rolled vehicle, a three vehicle motorcycle crash, a car in the river, a two vehicle collision including a livestock trailer; several of these were fatalities. The point I wish to make with this is that I was NOT a frequent commuter on US 93 and even in my relatively few number of trips, I personally was stuck in a disproportion number of traffic stops because of vehicle accidents. THIS IS A DANGEROUS HIGHWAY. For the sake of the safety of their own drivers and other motorists on the road, these trucks should not be allowed on 93.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic. Furthermore, US 93 over Lost Trail is a popular route for recreational road bicyclists, as well as it is not uncommon to have bicycle tourists on other parts of Highway 93. Especially for much of the stretch of US 93 between Salmon and Challis, the road is against a canyon wall and the river; accidents on this highway can be and have been devastating. With trucks on this highway, it would not be a matter of if but when one of these big rigs was involved.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana
- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduce that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to the area.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. Salmon already has noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from the town. The town does NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if road conditions are bad. They need to take into consideration local residents' lives over their own profits.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please consider these comments, as it is lives of both cities, truckers, and other motorists that will be affected by increased traffic .

Thank you for your time,

Brianna Goehring

Received 12/20/2019 11:12PM

- - -

Lance,

I don't support large double trucks on Hwy 93. Our town's geography and layout mean that there's no poss of a bypass. And our regional roads are narrow and windy, already dangerous enough without more large truck traffic. send those suckers up I-15 please.

Last: please stop spraying salt on our roads! Go back to lava rock and plows. You'll save a ton on repaving. And my car will stop dissolving into a heap of rust.

Thx

~ Chris Swersey
Salmon, Idaho
Received 12/20/2019 4:52PM

- - -

Dear Mr. Green,

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion on the proposed expansion of truck/trailer weight and length on Highway 93. As a nearly daily driver on 93 I strongly oppose these expansions.

This road is very narrow, windy and full of additional hazards. When anyone from out of the area comes to visit I always warn them about the windy road that quite often has rocks, snow and ice on it and almost always has wildlife too...not to mention that a misstep may land you in the river. We see a large number of tourists unfamiliar with the dangers of this road bring risks to themselves and others on the road through poor driving. It takes a lot of close attention and defensive driving to navigate this highway safely without the addition of bigger trucks. We have a lot of accidents just from the inherent risks on this highway. Big trucks will cause more risk and more accidents. They are slow and will necessitate more passing, they are slow to stop and cannot navigate sharp curves well putting them over the centerline or off the side of the road.

It is also important to think of the reasons people come here. One of the most popular is our river. Additional truck traffic puts our river at risk from accidents and contamination of our water. When we do have a truck accident here it is hours to get a capable wrecker here to deal with an accident. In the meantime our river is being polluted. We have vulnerable fish species that can ill afford yet another risk to their survival.

Wildlife is also of great concern. It breaks my heart to see the number of animals that are hit and killed on Highway 93. Bigger trucks are going to mean more animal deaths.

And, this is a biggie, for much of our area the only road is Highway 93. A big rig wreck could block our lifeline highway. Block our route to medical services and block our daily travel route.

Bottom line. Expanded truck/trailer weight and length on Highway 93 will do nothing but increase the risk to people, animals and environment. This is a bad idea.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Latham
Salmon, ID 83467
Received 12/20/2019 4:18PM

- - -

Dear Mr. Green

I urge you and the Idaho Dept of Transportation (IDT) to oppose the current proposal that would expand truck/trailer weight and length on Hwy 93.

My concerns are based on my own experience driving Hyw 93 regularly, especially the section between Salmon and Gibbonsville.

First, many big game animals including deer, elk, and bighorn sheep reside and especially winter in this corridor along Hwy 93. I urge you to drive this road section right now (Dec 20) and observe all of the wildlife adjacent to- and on- the road. The residents in this area have learned to drive slower speeds to avoid collisions with animals. Despite the locals preventive actions, many big game animals die each year on this stretch of highway. Truckers will not be so careful and likely have little concern for wildlife when they are on transport time lines.

Second, this route is heavily traveled by myself as well as tourists and hunters and fishermen that contribute to the local economies. Many of us haul trailers and also admire the wildlife and scenery. In addition to wildlife, Hwy 93 has other unique hazards including falling rocks and trees, sharp bends, steep banks, ice and snow, open range cattle, cattle drives, and a river paralleling most of the route. Adding heavier and longer trucks is unsafe and a bad idea. Such trucks will add additional hazards for regular traffic by increased stopping distance, decreased clearance on tighter corners, and their additional length.

Third, the Salmon River and its fish are unique and essential cultural, economic, ecological, and recreational resources. The Salmon River is a National Wild and Scenic River and it supports several species of fish that are protected under the Endangered Species Act. These include: Chinook salmon, Steelhead, Sockeye salmon, and Bull Trout. Additional heavier and longer trucks increase the risk that a truck will slide into the river and spill toxic fuel or other chemicals.

For the safety of everyone who drives Hyw 93; for the protection of the big game animals, native fish, and the Wild and Scenic Salmon River; and for the protection of the local economies that depend on these natural resources and a safe Hyw 93;

I strongly urge you and IDT to oppose the permitting of heavier and longer trucks.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Russ Thurow
Salmon, Idaho 83467
Received 12/20/2019 1:44PM

- - -

Hello Lance

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I strongly urge the ITD to NOT ALLOW the proposal that would expand truck/trailer weight and length on Hwy 93. I have used this Hwy daily to commute from my home near North Fork, Idaho to Salmon and for Challis for work, recreation and community activities for 43 years.

Here are my concerns:

1. This route is heavily traveled by tourists, hunters and fishermen for 9-10 months each year. Many of these folks are pulling trailers, admiring the scenery and pulling in and out of turn outs. Most are not familiar with the Hwy 93 and it's peculiar hazards - wildlife, falling rocks and trees, sharp turns, steep banks, ice and snow, open range cattle, cattle drives, and a swift river along most of the route. Adding heavier and longer trucks to this mix is a bad idea. This highway is accident prone with current legal traffic.
2. This is a Wild and Scenic Highway and should have require special restrictive considerations when planning for additional and arguably, more hazardous, traffic.
3. Wildlife, especially big game animals such as deer, elk and mountain sheep, are heavily concentrated from Gibbonsville to Arco. These are very valuable state resources and unfortunately many die each year on this stretch of highway. Many of the truckers use very heavy grill guards and drive with little concern for wildlife and at speeds that may be legal but that are not prudent.
4. Longer, heavier trucks will be an additional hazard for regular local traffic due to the increase stopping distance, decreased clearance on tighter corner and additional length will make safe passing more difficult.
5. The Salmon River is known world wide as a spectacular Wild and Scenic River. It also has a number of fish species that are ESA listed; Chinook salmon, Sockeye salmon, steelhead, white sturgeon and Bull Trout. Additional trucks with hazardous cargos of additional weights will only increase the risk to these species should a truck end up in the river.

Please refrain from permitting trucks of this size to use this route. It can only result in increased accidents.

Thank you.

Jerry Myers
North Fork, ID 83466
Received 12/20/2019 12:12PM

- - -

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions from inversions and woodsmoke. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.
- The safety of Salmon school students will be at a greater risk as the schools are along Highway 93 and 28.
- Interstates were built for purposes including truck routes, they should be used for this - not our wild and scenic highways.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

I agree with all the above points stated by Jenny Gonyer.

Thank you for your time,

Kelsey Stansberry

Received 12/20/2019 12:08 PM

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Although this is a tourist town, this is NOT the kind of guests we want to be hosting. Or the type of businesses we want crowding our small town.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have few to none alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,

Fallon Born

Received 12/20/2019 12:03PM

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,

Alicia Edwards

Received 12/20/2019 10:41AM

Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route

As stated by a fellow land lover and friend: Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.

U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.

If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.

Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.

Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.

Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.

U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.

Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.

More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.

This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you,
Alicia McDermott
Received 12/20/2019 10:39AM

- - -

Lance,

My name it's Alicia Gilpin. I have been a resident of Salmon, Idaho for 20 years. I agreed fully with all of the email below, written by a colleague and friend of mine.

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.
- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.

- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits. And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,
Alicia Gilpin
Received 12/20/2019 10:36AM

- - -

Dear Mr. Green, I'm writing this to express our feelings against the proposed permit to allow oversized and increased weight truck/trailer traffic on Highway 93 through Salmon. We live on Highway 93 S. and being that the highway is only a two lane road this extra truck traffic would cause not only a safety hazard but also cause increased noise and wear on the Highway. Thank You, Robert and Tina Mauterstock, 211 Highway 93 S. Salmon Idaho
Robert Mauterstock
Received 12/20/2019 9:37AM

- - -

Hi Lance,

Here are my comments on the Truck Route Application for U.S. 93 Idaho 75 District 6 Public Hearing. I vote NO, and am against this permit application. Below are my reasons why.

First, the public comment period should be extended. This seemed to be a very rushed process with little advertisement. I've heard of many people being upset that they just heard about this, and the comment deadline provided is tomorrow.

Reasons why this permit should Not be granted:

- This is a Wild and Scenic Highway. More trucks reduces that value. It impacts wildlife, the quiet, and affects visitors to our beautiful river valleys.
- U.S. 93 has a lot of sharp curves that are dangerous for even school buses, larger trucks would pose a greater risk to oncoming traffic.
- If a truck were to have an accident into the river, it would pollute our river which is Home to endangered wild salmon and steelhead.
- Our economy depends on this river and the scenic values it offers. More trucks would reduce that value and harm our economy especially if a truck accident polluted our river.
- Lost Trail Pass is not a great option for an alternative route. If Monida Pass is closed due to winter conditions, Lost Trail would have worse conditions. More large trucks on this pass poses a safety risk to winter recreationists going to Lost Trail Ski Hill, Chief Jo trails for skiing and snowmobiling, hunters, and travelers between Idaho and Montana.

- Air pollution. Salmon, ID during the winter has unhealthy air quality conditions. Adding more diesel trucks will make the situation even worse. As a resident who walks often to work, even in the winter, I would like cleaner air to breathe while I'm walking. I do not want to breathe in more diesel fumes.
- U.S. 93 goes straight through Salmon's downtown with no truck route. We already have noisy semi-trucks rolling through downtown, adding noise and fumes, which takes away value from our quaint little town. We do NOT need more trucks coming through.
- Road damage. More trucks would result in more road maintenance. Construction takes forever on U.S. 93 since it has only two lanes. We have limited alternatives to avoid construction.
- More traffic poses a danger to our river recreationists that are parked along the already narrow roads.
- This company does not "need" an alternate route. They can delay their travels if bad weather conditions. They need to take into consideration local residents lives over their own profits.

And there are more reasons I could list, but these are the biggest concerns and reasons to Not grant this permit for an alternate truck route on U.S. 93.

I hope Idaho Transportation Department makes the right decision and says No to this permit. It is clear that this is Not a safe or smart truck route alternative.

Please take our concerned local citizens voices into consideration, as it is our lives and towns that will be affected by increased traffic and pollution.

Thank you for your time,
Jenny Gonyer
Salmon, ID 83467
Received 12/20/2019 9:36AM

- - -

I missed the meeting in Salmon last week for the proposed tandem semi truck corridor on Hwy 93. I do not think this is a good idea for a few reasons. The first reason is safety. Having huge trucks on tight, windy road from Challis to the town of Darby, MT is unsafe. Driving these roads anytime from August to May can be hazardous. The second reason is road quality. Heavy trucks wear the road surface down quickly. It takes a lot to get our roads repaired. Who pays for this and to repair our vehicles after driving on rutted roads? These large trucks should be relegated to the Hwy systems that are set up for their size and the ability for other vehicles to get around them. Thank you for letting me express my opinion.

Nancy Bolyard
Salmon, ID
Received 12/20/2019 8:51AM

- - -

Dear Sir: I am opposed to allowing 129,000-pound trucks on sections of U.S. 93 and Idaho 75.

My reasons include:

- the risk of spillage of toxic substances into our beautiful watershed
- the cost to our community that may incur if curbs and such are damaged as the over-sized trucks try to navigate our streets --the danger of reduced stopping distances available to trucks with such heavy loads - we have abundant wildlife that cause drivers to have to stop on a dime to avoid collision - what if such a large weighty truck is trailing such a car?
- the passage of these trucks on these routes will bring zero benefits to our community while presenting risk of potential municipal expenditures.

I wish I were more eloquent on this topic but my objection should be clear. Thank you sincerely for considering my point of view.

Respectfully, Gayle McCampbell

Received 12/19/2019 4:33PM

- - -

Lance, thank you for the chance to comment on the application for the 129,000 pound trucks that would come through Salmon, Idaho. I have concerns that to use this route as an option for that size of truck creates an unacceptable burden on our community.

- The trucks would have to come through Main Street which is not compatible with our downtown area.
- I would not like this application, if approved, to establish a precedent that this route is used for various other trucking opportunities through Salmon.
- This route follows a wildlife corridor and the amount of wildlife killed on the highway would increase.
- This route also follows a Wild and Scenic corridor, a toxic spill into the Salmon River or its tributaries would be devastating.
- Who would be responsible for the cost of the wear and tear on our local highway, I assume state and county coffers? They are often in bad repair without this added use.

Respectfully,

Terry Myers

Received 12/17/2019 2:28PM

- - -

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the requested allowance of 129,000 lb. loads.

In my taped comments I was erroneously under the impression that the requested change was the allowance of very long trucks, not just the allowance of the heavier loads. My point during that recording was that these very long trucks were seriously dangerous on any freeway/highway used by other motorists. As the additional weight will make these already dangerous vehicles even more so, my most serious concern is still the danger they represent to other motorists.

My other concerns regarding the increased weight are:

1. More damage to the road surface, which will result in increased cost to taxpayers for the upkeep of these roads, plus the disruption of traffic during the resurfacing processes.
2. Mr. Lott of Arlo Lott Trucking, the company requesting this change, touted the safety of his equipment and drivers, but had to admit that a large spill of molybdenum which occurred in the past was his load, but not one of his trucks. This fact indicates that he is not always in control of who transports his loads.
3. If approved, this change will open these highways to all trucking companies wishing to carry these heavier loads, not just the anticipated 700 trips a year to and from anticipated by Arlo Lott Trucking alone.
4. This section of Hwy 93 follows the Wild and Scenic-designated Salmon River, resulting in a narrow and winding road with narrow shoulders, making it more likely that any equipment failure or driver error could result in a serious accident, possibly causing injury to other motorists, or one of these huge loads ending up in the river. Since no environmental studies are necessary for the allowance of the heavier loads, there is the very real possibility hazardous materials could end up polluting this river as the result of an accident. Also, any accident could cause the complete shutdown of this main north-south Idaho route.
5. There will be times during bad winter conditions when these trucks will be required to chain up, but I and other people in attendance at the Dec. 9 meeting had never seen any of these long trucks with chains on, and additionally we were alarmed by the fact that they often drove very fast for the conditions and many times would seriously tailgate other motorists.

FOR THESE REASONS, I AM AGAINST THESE HEAVIER LOADS.

Mary Carroll

Received 12/16/2019 11:57AM

- - -

Comments: I oppose approving larger truck (129,000 pound) transport from Clayton to the Montana line for several reasons. With the exception of the Lost Trail Pass ascent, the route is winding and narrow, with insufficient pullouts to safely accommodate passing such a large vehicle. The route receives considerable travel by large camp-trailers whose drivers may be inexperienced at driving such roads; they don't need to encounter such large vehicles. Our towns are zero stoplight (Challis) and two stoplight (Salmon) communities and we don't need huge trucks on our main street (Salmon) where there are pedestrians and people getting into and out of parked cars along Hwy 93. This request seems to be for the benefit of a single applicant, with no discernible benefit to the affected communities along the transportation route. I oppose granting this application for 129,000-pound vehicle use.

Evalyn Bennett

Received 12/7/2019 12:38PM

- - -

Hello,

I live south of Salmon on HWY 93 and my family and I are opposed to increased trailer traffic.

We've only lived here for 2 years and have seen trucks and trailers Wreck because they fail to make the curve of the road near our house.

The semi trucks we pass on the road often cross the center line while maneuvering the tight curves between Challis and Salmon.

Interstates are appropriate for large vehicles, NOT scenic byways.

Thank you,

Kelly Vanderveer

Received 12/6/2019 9:48AM

Phone Calls:

From Paul Werner of North Fork, ID 3 miles S. of Gibbonsville 12/20/2019

He wanted to make official comments regarding his opposition to the 129k application along US93. He was unable to attend the meeting and therefore is calling in. He is strongly opposed to allowing 129k on US93. The curvature of the road around Sheep Creek is dangerous. There is also a blindspot pulling out from Gibbonsville onto the highway, which is a danger. The wildlife that are constantly being hit along the road, pose a great safety hazard. He also doesn't want to open up US93 to more heavy truck traffic. If Arlo Lott wants to put money where their mouth is they need to put money into Monida Pass to make in an alternate route. The fact that long trucks cross the center line is dangerous to the traveling public.

- - -

From David Dobbs of Salmon, ID 12/19/2019

He wanted to make official comments. He informed me that he is against the approval of 129K along US93. He mentioned 4 objections:

- 1) Who is going to pay for the additional wear and tear to the roadway that is caused due to weight.
 - 2) What's in it for Salmon? The truckers aren't going to stop in Salmon, so there is little benefit to Salmon business or residents. This only benefits the hauler.
 - 3) The turn from US93 on to main street is difficult. Can the trucks even clear this turn safely?
 - 4) This invites more truck companies to use this road, causing more damage.
- - -

From John Black of Elk Bend, ID on 11/25/2019

He wanted to make some official statements. I did inform him of the meeting at the opportunity to have any questions or concerns he may have answered. He will not be able to attend the meetings as he doesn't want to travel at night. He was going to see if he could get a petition together and have that delivered to us.

His concerns were about the road bedding and if the road could handle the weight, since there have been slides in this area and there are already cracks in the road since the last refinishing of the road. He is also concerned about the road bend and the tight angles the trucks would have to make. He is concerned about the speed limit, and feels it should be lowered. He is concerned about the accidents caused by animal strikes, that happen regularly in his area. He is concerned because this is a tourist corridor, and in the summer there is lots of slow moving traffic along this wildlife and scenic river corridor, along with bicyclists. He is not in favor of 129k being allowed on US93. He would like his concerns to be official recognized as a part of the public comment.

- - -

From Jessica, she lives in Salmon on 12/4/2019.

She had great concern with the allowance of 129k loads on US93, and wanted to know why the applicant doesn't use a different route (US93 south to Arco). She will be at the meeting to make official public comments.

- - -

From V.J. Greenwood, who has lived between Salmon and North Fork for the last 50 years on 12/3/2019.

He is concerned with the speed that trucks are allowed to travel. He cites that loads have been lost along this route before due to speed. He also had great concern about the loss of animal life along this route. His suggestion is that the speed limit along the road should be lowered. He may be able to attend the public hearing, but wanted to be sure that if not that his opinion was captured and heard.

Letters:

Jim Kopp, Challis, ID

I see less trucks & less wear & tear on the roadways. This is an advantage for the trucker, the customer and the highway department.

I fully support the heavier loads.

Why wouldn't you do this?

- - -

Robin Phillips, Salmon, ID

I am against the proposal for permitting 90' long rigs at 129,000 pounds on US93 because of the negative effects on our tourism and as a public safety issue. With 93 having so many curves it will be impossible for these rigs to maintain a reasonable speed and it will be a public safety risk trying to pass them. Route 93 doesn't have the road structure to accommodate these rigs.

- - -

Dave Gusky, Salmon, ID

I DO NOT APPROVE OF THE PROPOSED TRUCKING REQUEST _ BASICALLY BECAUSE THE SCHEDULED MEETING IN SALMON _ DEC 9 – 4-6:30 WAS A B--- S--- SESSION AND NOT AN INFORMATIVE MEETING.

THE ONLY ENTITY THAT SHOWED UP WAS THE IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. NO INFORMATION FROM TRUCKING Co. , ETC.

WHAT A WASTE OF TIME!

- - -

Tom Stillwaugh, Challis, ID

I support allowing the increase in weight on Highway 93 + 75. The information provided shows that the trucks operate safe at these weights plus then actual weight per square inch is less. That relates to less wear and tear on the roads. The business I work for will require less load, thus less trucks on the road. I hope Idaho Transportation Department will change the limits as proposed.

- - -

Mike Solterson, N. Fork, ID 12/1/19

MR. Green

In regards to truck trailer using Hwy 93. I strongly am against this due to the fact that this is a scenic by-way. Truckers now Do not observe speed limit of 65 mph. (Which is way too fast for this road) There is too many semis on the road Hwy 93 the way it is now. This opens up a whole can of worms. I've lived here for 55 yrs in the Salmon- N. Fork area. Bad idea to increase weight of these vehicles.

- - -

Jerry Perry, Salmon, ID

I object to the heavy trucks using our hi ways because there is no money allocated for road up keep or replacement. I know they pay road use tax on all miles traveled but that money goes into one place for all road construction in the state. The big towns get fixed first and we have to live with bad roads. Your representative said it will not affect the roads because of the extra axles will distribute the weight. I say all truck traffic on the roads in this route will affect the roads with no upkeep.

The road from montana line to challis is very narrow and crooked. There is already accident on the sharp corners. The stop signs in to salmon is very adverce and trucks have a hard time getting started; worse when there is ice and snow. The stop signs at junction hw 93 and hw 28 is very sharp. Truck uses the sidewalk a lot.

The trucker would rather go through salmon instead of the freeway because of sage junction.

- - -

Virginia Perry, Salmon, ID

I object to the heavy trucks using our hi ways because there is no money allocated for road up keep or replacement. I know they pay road use tax on all miles traveled but that money goes into one place for all road construction in the state. The big towns get fixed first and we have to live with bad roads. Your representative said it will not affect the roads because of the extra axles will distribute the weight. I say all truck traffic on the roads in this route will affect the roads with no upkeep.

The road from montana line to challis is very narrow and crooked. There is already accident on the sharp corners. The stop signs in to salmon is very adverce and trucks have a hard time getting started; worse when there is ice and snow. The stop signs at junction hw 93 and hw 28 is very sharp. Truck uses the sidewalk a lot.

The trucker would rather go through salmon instead of the freeway because of sage junction.

- - -

Paul A. Edstrom, North Fork, ID

Mr. Lance Green,

I've lived along Highway 93 north of North Fork for 30 years. This narrow twisting, turning route from North Fork to Lost Trail Pass is in an area of considerable wildlife and is in fact a big game wintering area. The deer and elk killed along this stretch of the highway is staggering. Part of the problem is brush and trees are allowed to grow close to the blacktop blocking visibility. Then the 65 mph speed limit is too fast for large trucks.

These large trucks cannot brake fast enough to avoid the game. To a trucker time is money and so they go to beat hell knowing their large bumpers and front end guards (that rival locomotive cow catchers) will protect them from any damage. I walk the highway a lot for exercise and find and report to fish & game many animals either dead or in need to be dispatched. I can tell passenger vehicle kills from truck kills because large truck kills leave no glass and plastic part fragments at the impact site.

Therefore I am against any more and larger trucks. Also, lower the truck speed limit between North Fork and Lost Trail pass and do some clearing of brush and trees along the highway right of way.

- - -

Bob Russel, Salmon, ID

I do not believe those heavy vehicles should be allowed – these roads are not built for heavy loads, damage will result. There is often wildlife crossing these roads, and such heavy loads cannot stop to let them pass. Rocks and other debris are often falling into the road which requires quick response by drivers – in this case it would increase the danger to other drivers with these loads dodging debris.

The main street of Salmon, ID is already extremely busy with traffic – these loads would exacerbate that problem. There are numerous cross-walks requiring traffic to stop quickly.

The city of Salmon has only one bridge crossing the Salmon River- if one of these loads were to break down on that bridge it would cripple traffic throughout the community. Also the bridge is getting some age on it and these heavy loads may put it out {????}/

Interstate Highways are designed for this type of traffic – please confine it to the interstate highways and deny this request for an exception.

- - -

Randall G. Thomas, P.E., Salmon, ID

These segments of US93, and ID75 already have congestion issues with slow moving vehicles which either: Ignore Idaho's slow vehicle pullover statute, or:

Drive at less than the yellow advisory speed in every corner, and then speed up to above the speed limit in every straight away, (aka "Passing Zone").

I would be neutral on this issue if new slow vehicle pullouts were constructed at maximum ten mile increments, and additional signing erected.

With the current roadway geometrics, I must oppose this proposal to increase the number of slow vehicles on the roadway.

- - -

Glenn and Camilla Hugunin, North Fork, ID

We are **opposed** to the proposed truck weight limit increase to 129,000 lbs. on Highways 93 and 75 for the following reasons:

A. SAFETY

1. Highway 75 and 93 were not designed to handle vehicles of this weight. We have been commuting and driving on these roads for 42 years. These backroads already have lots of traffic, especially from spring thru fall. These highways were also not designed for a 65 mph speed limit. There are too many obstacles on this road such as school bus stops, children, joggers, bicyclists, motor cyclists, curves, ice, snow, mud slides, avalanches, rocks, big game, cattle, horses, tourists, commuters, farm machinery, trucks and logging traffic. Do we really need larger, more dangerous trucks as well? My wife has been an R.N. at Steele Memorial Hospital, in Salmon, for 40 years. She has seen far too many injuries and fatalities already on these two highways. Allowing 129,000 lb. trucks will only increase these numbers. **Interstate 15** was designed to handle longer, heavier trucks and increased traffic safely.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL

1. These sections of Highways 75 and 93 are adjacent to the Salmon River, A National Wild and Scenic River. Adding 129,000 lb. trucks that are loaded with mining equipment and products, will greatly increase the likelihood of an accident, and spill into the Salmon River. Again, **Interstate 15** is far more suited to handle such an emergency.

- - -

Dear Mr Green:

I say "NO" to the apparent decision which has been made to allow heavier loads on tandem semi-trailers and trucks to negotiate US Hwy #93 from Challis to Salmon to the Montana state line. A commercial vehicle corridor encompassing US Hwy #93 from Challis to Arco, and proceeding from Arco via State Hwys #26, 33 and 22 to I-15 at Dubois, is the PERFECT truck route to Montana.

I worked in the Challis area while residing in Salmon for 20 years and very familiar with the disastrous history of commercial trucking in this corridor. In addition, I have lived adjacent to US Hwy #93 for the last 40 years in Salmon. Truck traffic from Montana through Salmon and into southern Idaho has increased demonstrably in the last 25 years following the decision made by former Governor Batt to allow increased loads which began the

accelerated surface deterioration of US Hwy #93 during that period. I must say now that the proposal to allow for even heavier and longer trailers and semi's on this section of US Hwy #93 is a complete joke. Tight curves, blind corners, tourists unfamiliar with the road and distracted by the spectacular scenery, coupled with large, big game wildlife populations often confined to the river road corridor make this area an extremely unsafe and difficult route to travel through during ANY season.

Believe me, the last thing the city of Salmon "needs" is additional and heavier commercial trucking on Main Street. I am concerned about accelerated air pollution, and the dust, dirt, diesel fumes and noise associated with commercial trucking, the inadequacy of the existing route through Salmon to handle such traffic as demonstrated by tight, blind turns and crushed highway signs due to narrow right of ways, and increased commercial traffic passing through school zones. Main Street has already failed to accommodate lengthy cattle trucks and wide loads headed to Dakota's oil fields, without special preparation. We already have the worst "engineered" turn on the entire length of US Hwy #93 running from Mexico to Canada. It's a real winner – a 90 degree turn which is seldom negotiated cleanly by current tractor trailer vehicles.

US Hwy #93 has been repaved this summer and is currently in the best condition it has been in its entire existence. However, the highway is in no way able to accommodate increased commercial loads and tandem trailers safely especially during winter even with pouring more money into the road by salt application and accelerated plowing. Snow and ice will always persist during winter in the 4000-7000ft elevations, requiring truckers to chain up which they will resist, and thereby compromising safety for ALL vehicle traffic.

Bottomline:

- a. A perfectly good, year-round (in most cases) truck route exists to meet the commercial trucking needs. Lost Trail Pass in winter should not be considered as a reliable, nor viable, substitute for commercial trucking via I-15 and Monida Pass in Montana.
- b. Salmon, Idaho cannot handle more dirt, dust, diesel fumes, school zone violations, crushed highway signs and associated noise on Main Street.
- c. Expanded commercial trucking will be detrimental to our wildlife populations, and tourism values found in our unparalleled wild and scenic corridor.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I hope you will seriously consider the public comments that I know you have received from knowledgeable and concerned local citizens who also do not support this proposal.

Sincerely,

s/s William C Osborne

William C Osborne
Salmon, ID 83467

- - -



208.345.6933 • PO Box 844, Boise, ID 83702 • www.idahoconservation.org

December 20, 2019

Mr. Lance Green

DMV Program Specialist

Idaho Transportation Department

3311 W. State Street

Boise, ID 83707

(208) 334-8427

Electronically Submitted: lance.green@itd.idaho.gov

RE: Idaho Conservation League's Comments Regarding the Proposed Route/Specification Changes for Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc.

Dear Mr. Green:

Please accept our comments regarding the proposed changes to Idaho Highway 75 and U.S. Highway 93 to allow Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. to transport molybdenum from Clayton, Idaho through Challis and Salmon to the Montana border. Since 1973, the Idaho Conservation League (ICL) has worked to protect and enhance Idaho's clean water, wilderness, and quality of life through citizen action, public education, and professional advocacy. The Idaho Conservation League has a long history of involvement with mining and environmental protections. As Idaho's largest statewide conservation organization, ICL represents over 30,000 supporters who have a deep personal interest in ensuring that mining operations, including material transportation, are protective of our land, water, fish, and wildlife.

We have serious concerns regarding the proposal to allow trailered trucks to transport 129,000-pound loads on US-93, particularly during the winter months. First, molybdenum is not a benign substance, despite concentrate being relatively insoluble in water; extended exposure poses long-term risks to aquatic life. Further, molybdenum concentrates likely contain additional components which may pose hazards to human life and the environment and the applicant should reveal and list any additional constituents being transported. Transporting these increased loads requires modifying accepted trucking and transportation limitations on small-size local highways just upstream of the the Congressionally-designated Salmon River Wild and Scenic corridor.

On January 19, 2019, ICL spoke with you (Mr. Lance Green) about questions we have regarding unconfirmed information pertaining to Lott Trucking's reason for the modification request. We learned that truck length will not change due to established restrictions on US-93 between Challis and Salmon (a Blue-designated section, allowing 95' truck/trailers). However, we did confirm that this modification request is based on seeking an alternative route to I-15 during winter. According to Mr. Green, Lott Trucking justified the request by citing adverse conditions on I-15 during severe storms, stating that the interstate is not well kept, tends to gather snow drifts, and often closes during severe weather. Further, US-93 was cited as being better maintained and usually remains open when I-15 closes. We do not believe using Lost Trail Pass, which receives up to 300" of snow per year and can have high winds with significant drifting and snowpack/icing issues on a narrow, winding mountain road, serves as a realistic nor functional alternative to a closed federal highway. State Highway Patrol offices and Transportation Departments do not close routes due to adverse conditions without considerable thought and reasoning. We believe if the preferred route is closed due to adverse conditions, operators should wait until conditions improve, reducing risks to human health, company infrastructure (by proactively avoiding an accident), and the environment.

Our concerns regarding the potential for accidents and spills directly below the Wild and Scenic corridor are grounded in recent history. In May of 2018, a truck owned by Arlo G. Lott Trucking, Inc. crashed into a guardrail near the Big Hole River, dumping 48,000 pounds of molybdenum. Fortunately, there were no injuries and no materials reached the Big Hole River. While this incident occurred in Montana, it does not preclude the possibility of an accident in Idaho along the same route, particularly during the winter when US-93 would be used as an alternative route.

US-93 contains two sections that currently maintain length and off-track restrictions based on the winding and mountainous nature of the highway. Moreover, the increased truck traffic through downtown Challis and Salmon, Idaho will increase congestion and the potential for vehicle and pedestrian accidents. While analysis may indicate road and bridge conditions are sufficient to support 129,000 pound loads, traveler and environmental safety must remain the most important factors in this equation.

ITD's proposal evaluation indicates that 1,000 trips of 105,500 pounds annually occur under current conditions, and the hand-modified application for a 129,000 pound route designation (dated 11/9/17) justifies the changes as increasing weight limits to enhance the transportation of molybdenum and to "reduce congestion, decrease carbon, and increase Efficiency." While we commend Lott Trucking for their environmental consciousness and desire to reduce their carbon footprint, we do not believe the inherent risks associated with transporting larger sized loads of hazardous materials outweigh the potential carbon footprint reduction. By our estimation, the established Arco route encompasses 330 miles as opposed to the proposed US-93 route of 230 miles. We do not believe the 100 mile difference justifies the increased threat to human safety and the environment.

We believe allowing heavier loads on US-93 poses risks to human health and the environment that cannot be justified, and we encourage the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) to reject this proposal. Making an exception can quickly lead to establishing a standard, and ICL does not believe these mountain passes and roads, particularly through river corridors, should be used for over-sized material transportation. We confirmed that, should ITD approve this request, it will establish a precedent for additional trucking companies to follow, which could lead to greatly increasing traffic densities, congestion, and the risk for accidents. Before these types of programmatic decisions be made, ITD should conduct a thorough analysis of roads and associated infrastructure to ensure that the existing road widths, bridges, engineering designs, and emergency facilities (such as runaway truck ramps, chain-up/brake test areas, etc.) are sufficient to withstand consistent use by trucks carrying 120,000-pound loads. Moreover, ITD should conduct a safety study focused on the impacts to towns along the proposed route and define the potential for increased risk to human health prior to making such binding decisions.

Should ITD choose to approve this load alteration proposal, we believe the department should enact several mitigation measures. First, the applicant and ITD should install additional spill containment caches along route corridor described in the application. These caches should include materials necessary to contain and facilitate any spills on land or in the water containment. These could include both absorbent pads, straw bales, and booms. The applicant and ITD should schedule loads to avoid transporting materials on days with high traffic volumes, such as nationally recognized holidays, weekends, and local significant events. ITD should work with the applicant to update safety protocols regarding winter weather advisories, and US-93 should not serve as the primary transportation route during winter storm events due to the increased levels of ice, snow and winds associated with Lost Trail Pass. Chains should be required during potentially freezing conditions. Finally, we recommend the applicant and ITD review and update molybdenum storage and containment protocols.

However, the best path forward is for ITD to prohibit the use of US-93 N through Salmon as a transport option for this large, molybdenum-bearing trucks due to the concerns identified above.

Thank you for reviewing our comments regarding this proposal. If you have any questions about our comments, or if we can provide additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to working with the Idaho Transportation Department on this, and other issues in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John Robison". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending from the "J".

John Robison

Public Lands Director

Idaho Conservation League

jrobison@idahoconservation.org

(208) 345-6933 ext. 13

- - -

Tawna Skinner Salmon, ID

My name is Tawna Skinner and I live in Salmon, ID. I do not think it is a good idea (I am opposed to it) to allow 129,000lb trucks on the sections of HWY 93 from Lost Trail Pass south through Salmon and on to Challis. This stretch of roadway is quite narrow with narrow shoulders and few pullouts. It is a highway that is snow covered and icy most of the winter and the area is habitat for many big game animals that cross this highway daily going to water & feed. It has many tight curves and few places to pass. Heavy trucks will tend to travel faster as gravity pulls them downhill despite another axle and better braking as told to us at the meeting. It will take longer for these trucks to stop thus avoiding hitting big game animals will be nearly impossible.

Allowing this permit will open up the road to other trucking companies which will increase use by all companies. I am opposed to this.

This road is used by families going to & from the ski areas on Lost Trail Pass. More truck traffic will make it more dangerous than it already is. School buses use this Hwy 5 days a week. More traffic will make it more unsafe for our children going and coming to school.

More trucks & heavier trucks will make more noise, more exhaust and will increase the damage to the road surface. Overall giving the permit to use HWY 93 & 75 to the Lott Trucking Company is a bad idea and I am opposed to it. Let them stay on the interstate where they are meant and allowed to be even if it is closed at times. All drivers have to deal with road closures due to weather. They should not be

privileged to drive elsewhere especially where the conditions are no better and can make driving situations even more hazardous for other people, animals and communities.

I am opposed to allowing the permit to the Lott Trucking Company.

- - -

Joene Shieve Salmon, ID

I vehemently oppose allowing these super large trucks to use US93 and ID75. These large trucks do not belong on two-lane, heavily traveled highways. My concern for US93 is personal safety. I live in Salmon and know this highway very well. There are many roads and driveways that enter and exist this highway from farms and homes. Many RVs travel this highway, north and south, - trucks pulling travel trailers & 5th wheels as well as large motor homes. Also river outfitters pull trailers stacked with rafts and carry river rafters in buses. Included are fishermen pulling boats. Add all these recreational vehicles to the car and single truck (both private and commercial) traffic that travels this highway daily, you can obviously see how negatively these super trucks will impact US93 and the safety of the drivers and passengers. The highway has very narrow or non-existent shoulders for vehicles to pull over if they want to allow vehicles behind them to pass. The curves in the highway portion between north of Big Flat and North Fork are especially concerning. Traffic when heavy is often very slow along this stretch. All you need is an impatient driver try to pass a large truck, and you have a very bad accident waiting to happen.

All this is in addition to the damage to the highway these super large trucks would cause. The state just improved the roadway between Big Flat and Lost Trail Pass in the past couple of years and I don't want to see these super trucks ruin that.

I don't know much about ID 75, but I feel my concerns would apply to this highway also.

Keep those super trucks on the interstate, four lane highways (Even though I don't really like them either!) People come to these parts of Idaho to get away from these type of vehicles!

Thank you!

- - -

Concerned Citizen Tiffany Shelton, Jenny Gonyer, Sadie Slamka Salmon, ID

Extend Comment period! Not much notice/advertisement given to community.

This is not a safe route alternative for many reasons.

- Sharp icy turns on river road segments
- If Monida is closed, lost river likely would have worse winter conditions.
- Wildlife danger.

This is a Wild & Scenic Highway. We don't need and more trucks congesting our highways, or causing environmental damage if the truck were to have an accident in the river.

I vote NO to this permit, this is not a safe alternative.

*Sent an email as well!

Oral Comments

BEFORE THE IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

DISTRICT SIX

IN RE:
129K HEARING
SALMON and CHALLIS, IDAHO.

TRANSCRIPTION OF DIGITAL RECORDING

RE: 129K HEARING -- PUBLIC COMMENTS

B E F O R E

ITD HEARING OFFICER ROBERT HOFF

Reported by: Lori A. Pulsifer, RDR, CRR, CSR No. 354

1 FOLLOWING IS A TRANSCRIPTION OF THE DIGITAL
2 RECORDING of public comments before Idaho Transportation
3 Department Hearing Officer Robert Hoff regarding the
4 129K Hearing (Salmon and Challis, Idaho) transcribed by
5 Lori A. Pulsifer, Transcriber, Court Reporter (Idaho
6 Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 354) and Notary Public
7 in and for the County of Ada, State of Idaho.

8

9 (Following is a transcription of the audio
10 file labeled z0000009.)

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: I'm the hearing officer,
12 and I've got Vince here with me.

13 Just start by stating your name and your
14 address and who you're representing, if you're not
15 representing yourself.

16 And you can -- any questions, you need to ask
17 the crew out there. I'm not here to answer questions.
18 So just --

19 CHUCK FELTON: My name is Chuck Felton. I'm
20 from Challis, Idaho. I'm a city councilman here. I
21 travel the roads of Eastern Idaho quite extensively.

22 I understand the configuration on these trucks,
23 and if they go -- if they go to that configuration, you
24 know, it's okay. I mean, they're putting less pressure
25 on the highway than the ones they have now.

1 And I'm just kind of here to complain about the
2 roads. I drove them today. The road between Craters of
3 the Moon and Arco and Richfield -- they're just a
4 travesty for the state of Idaho.

5 They're rough. I broke a spring on the road
6 between Craters and going through Carey -- that area --
7 one time on my AT -- or on my RV. And they're just
8 really bad roads.

9 And it's like the road between INL and
10 Blackfoot. I'm afraid to even drive the speed limit on
11 that road. I mean, in a truck -- or in a pickup -- I
12 should say -- or something like that -- the roads are
13 just bad.

14 I wrote a letter to ITD and asked them about
15 the -- one of them and if they have plans, if they're
16 under contingency to repair them; and I never got any
17 response back. So anyway -- so I'm just kind of
18 complaining.

19 THE HEARING OFFICER: Did you go to the
20 district engineer, or did you go to Boise?

21 CHUCK FELTON: No, I didn't. I just sent a
22 letter to ITD is all.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: But that highway, I
24 think, is District Five. I think it is.

25 MALE SPEAKER: It is.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

2 MALE SPEAKER: It's actually District Six.

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Is it in District Six?

4 MALE SPEAKER: I believe so, yeah.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

6 MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

7 CHUCK FELTON: The maps out here show --

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: It's District Six.

9 CHUCK FELTON: -- the red area is going through
10 that part of the (indiscernible). Yeah.

11 MALE SPEAKER: The one he's talking about --

12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Give me a call, if you
13 want. I'm on the Board, and my number will be on the
14 Internet.

15 CHUCK FELTON: On the Internet?

16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

17 CHUCK FELTON: Okay. Yeah. And your name was?

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Bob Hoff.

19 CHUCK FELTON: Hoff?

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. I don't mind a
21 call.

22 MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Are you out of Rigby?

24 CHUCK FELTON: No. I'm southeast
25 of (indiscernible). (Indiscernible) Farms, southeast of

1 (indiscernible).

2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, out there? Oh, okay.

3 CHUCK FELTON: I'll do that.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: I can't promise results,
5 but I can take complaints.

6 CHUCK FELTON: Yeah, I know. I'm on the city
7 council. Remember? We do what we can. Sometimes it's
8 out of our hands.

9 But, you know, like I say, I just drove it
10 today; and it's not good. I don't know how people in
11 Arco even stand to not be screaming every day about that
12 road.

13 And I know they ground off the road going into
14 Carey, coming in from the Twin Falls -- from the
15 Shoshone side. My wife even commented on it today.

16 She said, "Holy cow. What's wrong with this
17 road here?"

18 And I said, "Well, they ground it off," because
19 it was it was so ratty from them trucks.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Hmm.

21 CHUCK FELTON: It's just -- I just hate driving
22 it. The fact is I need to drive -- I need to take my
23 motorhome over -- down through Arco and Carey and Twin
24 Falls. You know, I hate to even drive it over that
25 road; but I have no other alternative.

1 So I won't take my motorhome between Blackfoot
2 and the INL at all. You know, when it gets slick, why,
3 the roads are tough. They're tough to drive. You know,
4 you have to go slower.

5 But, still, they're slick roads. They throw
6 you around. You've got to be very alert all of the
7 time. Anyway, that's my complaint.

8 MALE SPEAKER: Very good. Thank you, sir.

9 CHUCK FELTON: Thanks for listening.

10 (End of audio file.)

11 . . .

12 (The audio file labeled z000008 contains no
13 verbal content.)

14 . . .

15 (The audio file labeled z000007 contains no
16 verbal content.)

17 . . .

18 (Following is a transcription of the audio file
19 labeled z0000006.)

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: -- supposed to have all
21 of the answers out there.

22 MEGAN STARK: (Indiscernible) on the recording.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: We're just going to
24 listen.

25 JESSICA McALEESE: Okay.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Just relax and make the
2 case.

3 JESSICA McALEESE: My name is Jessica McAleese;
4 and I live on Highway 93 north, just a couple of miles
5 from town and --

6 MEGAN STARK: Can you state your address?

7 JESSICA McALEESE: Oh. 193 Highway 93 North,
8 Salmon, Idaho.

9 MEGAN STARK: Perfect.

10 JESSICA McALEESE: Number one: We have a local
11 paper that comes out in Salmon once a week. And so this
12 was in the paper, apparently, twice. But for those of
13 us who don't read the paper or get the paper -- I live
14 on 93, and I had no idea about this until somebody
15 brought it to my attention.

16 So perhaps in the future, you might want to
17 consider a little bit more direct communication with
18 people who are actually living along the route that's
19 being proposed to be a change of.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: This is what we put
21 out -- like, I see on fences -- sometimes when there's a
22 zone change, is there a notice out?

23 MEGAN STARK: Usually not, huh-uh.

24 JESSICA McALEESE: Yeah. That actually would
25 be a good idea, just a little tent out -- you know,

1 like, a little sandwich board or something.

2 MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

3 JESSICA McALEESE: Anyway -- so I've been a
4 little bit -- very, very concerned about the increase in
5 the weight limit because, living in Salmon, living in
6 this region, we drive the roads every single day.

7 And particularly in the summer -- we have a
8 small farm business. So we're driving from Salmon to
9 Stanley and back once a week, and we see -- boots on the
10 ground -- what is going on on this highway.

11 I live right down the road from the weigh
12 station, the port-of-entry weigh station, which isn't
13 open all of the time. So I have a pretty good handle on
14 what kind of trucks are going by, what kind of
15 activities are used on this highway corridor.

16 And there might not be a really good
17 representation of those activities when you just have
18 engineers crunching numbers.

19 Sure. The numbers work out for this type of
20 load. But what I am concerned about is that the
21 cultural perspective hasn't been taken into account.
22 This is a scenic corridor, the Lewis and Clark Scenic
23 Byway.

24 We have a tremendous amount of motorcyclists
25 who -- motorcycle gangs, Rolling Thunder -- we joke

1 about it because we're outside in our field every single
2 day in the summer, and Rolling Thunder goes by.

3 MALE SPEAKER: I'm one of those.

4 JESSICA McALEESE: Well, so is my dad.

5 But motorcyclists use this route as a
6 non-freeway route, which is fine; but there are certain
7 qualities to the scenic byway that they're utilizing it
8 for. And they stop in Salmon and they provide us an
9 economic, you know, piece of the puzzle.

10 In addition to motorcyclists, there are an
11 increasing number of bicyclists who use this route for
12 cross-country traffic. I probably see about two to
13 three cyclist groups per week in the summertime using --
14 and there's no shoulder.

15 If you -- did you drive this route on your way
16 from Idaho Falls, or did you come up 28?

17 MEGAN STARK: 28.

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: We came up 28.

19 JESSICA McALEESE: I would recommend, on your
20 way home, to drive through Challis.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: We'll go that way.

22 JESSICA McALEESE: Good. Because, then, you'll
23 see some of the concerns -- I'm pretty sure. I hope.

24 Cyclists use it. Kids -- going to and from
25 school, at least two bicycles per week pass our farm,

1 with young kids riding their bicycles into town. No
2 shoulder whatsoever.

3 And then the great western flavor of cattle
4 drives that pop up around every single blind turn that
5 you're not expecting throughout all times of year. More
6 than once, we are stuck in a cattle drive on this
7 particular highway.

8 And there's no flagging. There's no warning to
9 when these cows move. You'll often be driving around a
10 corner near Clayton and Challis, on U.S. 93, before --
11 between Ellis and Challis, and you'll come across, you
12 know, eighty head of cows in the middle of the highway,
13 a bunch of horses, people on ATVs, dogs. Everyone is
14 moving cows.

15 And I'm driving a light truck -- you know, a
16 little pickup -- loaded with veggies. Sometimes it's,
17 like, "Whoa," slam on your brakes because, here, you
18 have cattle.

19 With an increased weight limit to these
20 trucks -- Lance was just saying -- the engineer in
21 there -- that there's been studies done that it is more
22 difficult to slow down with the added axle.

23 I'm really concerned about -- not just that
24 they're going to be carrying molybdenum from Butte.
25 They've already had an accident up near Wisdom.

1 Last year, they dumped a 48,000-pound load of
2 molybdenum almost into the Big Hole River. Our
3 steelhead and salmon in this region are hanging on by a
4 thread -- by a thread.

5 And if they're carrying ammonium sulfate --
6 what they just said -- they're carrying salt. They're
7 carrying molybdenum.

8 It takes a driver who's sleepy. It takes a
9 driver that's not used to this heavier load. I don't
10 know about their training. He was trying to be
11 transparent, but he's also -- he was also being
12 bureaucratic.

13 So I don't know what their training schedule is
14 for their drivers, and they -- he said they're choosing
15 to use this route as an alternate route when I-15 is
16 closed at Monida, which means bad weather.

17 And these roads are not good-weather roads.
18 Nobody leaves the valley when a snow storm is happening.
19 Sure, Monida is closed. I can tell when Monida is
20 closed because all of the traffic comes through this
21 way, and it's super dangerous.

22 That kind of stuff isn't taken into account
23 with the engineers, not to mention the scenic byway.
24 Our town is the highway. If you've driven through it,
25 you know it.

1 There's a certain unfortunate matter when your
2 highway is your main street. People don't stop. Trucks
3 don't stop. Trucks don't see pedestrians. There's
4 dust. There's increased, you know, confusion in
5 traffic, especially during the summer months.

6 These trucks aren't going to be stopping here.
7 They're not going to be fueling here. We have the most
8 expensive gas. Why would they stop here to get gas?

9 And so I just -- I just would really hope that,
10 as our District Six representative, you really consider
11 the scenic qualities of this particular stretch of road.

12 I know that they want to use it as an
13 alternative trucking route; but, really, it opens up the
14 door to not just them but every single trucking company
15 that's, like, "Sweet. Now we can use it as a direct
16 route from Montana into Idaho."

17 And with our one port of entry that's rarely
18 open -- or it's not consistently open every day --
19 that's pretty easy to just sneak by with heavy loads,
20 sneak by with illegal loads.

21 There's not necessarily a state police or Idaho
22 Department of Transportation state police representative
23 here all of the time. We have local police, but there's
24 not a lot of oversight in Lemhi County.

25 And I'm sure this company would try to do the

1 best they can, but I'm just not confident that this is
2 the route that they need to increase their loads.

3 What else am I missing?

4 MEGAN STARK: Take your time.

5 JESSICA McALEESE: Yeah, I know.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: If you miss something,
7 you're welcome to come back.

8 MEGAN STARK: Yeah.

9 JESSICA McALEESE: And -- yeah. I'll write
10 letters and -- oh, the other thing I really liked during
11 this particular comment session was somebody would like
12 to see a cost-benefit analysis of the costs that it's
13 going to be -- increased loads on our roads, Lemhi
14 County, our highways that we drive every single day, on
15 our one single bridge that goes across town -- that's
16 it, one bridge, not to mention up and over Lost Trail
17 Pass, all of the other rest of the roadway.

18 But what is the cost of that increased load and
19 the number of trucks that might be using it? How many
20 of all of the routes in Idaho that are now the
21 129,000 -- once they were approved for the heavier
22 loads, how many more loads went on those roads?

23 Because it's not just this one single trucking
24 company that is going to benefit. We're going to have a
25 lot of trucking companies that take advantage of the

1 increased weight limit.

2 So I want to know: What is the cost to our
3 highways?

4 And that is taxpayers. I pay those. I make
5 probably about three to five cents an hour, if you want
6 to do the math, because I'm a farmer. I just don't want
7 to pay to increasingly repair these roads so that this
8 guy can haul toxic substances around.

9 They can use the freeway. He can use the
10 freeway. That's what it's there for. It's a straight
11 route, a safe route, and not, you know, waiting for a
12 disaster, which -- accidents will happen.

13 They're much more severe when it's in a
14 corridor like this. Much more severe. And who is going
15 to pay that cost?

16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Yeah. That's good
17 testimony.

18 JESSICA MCALEESE: Yeah. So at any rate, I
19 appreciate it. I know it's kind of -- I don't know.
20 Living in Idaho Falls, you are probably a little bit
21 removed from the community up here.

22 But we really care about our corridor, and
23 there's really good things happening here.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: I appreciate that.

25 JESSICA MCALEESE: And to have a company just

1 wanting to use our route as an alternative route so they
2 save a little bit of money -- it's not really worth it
3 to us because there's -- there's a lot here besides just
4 some savings.

5 So thank you very much.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you very
7 much.

8 (End of audio file.)

9 . . .

10 (Following is a transcription of the audio file
11 labeled z0000005.)

12 MARTHA EDGAR: First? What was it? Martha
13 Edgar. Am I supposed to --

14 MEGAN STARK: (Indiscernible).

15 MARTHA EDGAR: Martha Edgar, 38 Dogwood Lane,
16 Salmon, Idaho. What else? Oh, I'm representing myself.

17 MEGAN STARK: Perfect.

18 MARTHA EDGAR: I have land that fronts Highway
19 93, two miles out of town.

20 I'm very concerned with the fact that it's not
21 only a scenic river but that it's going to be dangerous.
22 Those bigger trucks, which some of them already -- I
23 mean, I've already seen them.

24 And there was a horrible jack-knife about two
25 weeks ago, on the way to Missoula, from just a regular

1 semi. I mean, it happens all of the time -- or --
2 okay -- enough so that it's pretty disturbing.

3 And I fear for our tourism because, once people
4 get behind these trucks, it's worse than those big,
5 rolling houses that people use in the summer, you know,
6 to try to get around.

7 So people are going to be stuck. We're not
8 going to be able to get where we can go. There are no
9 shoulders. We don't even have hard shoulders or even
10 hard -- well, we can't even ride bicycles on the side of
11 the road all the way out the highway, to 93.

12 So -- and like they were talking about, to stop
13 in time, it's dangerous. And those people -- okay. I
14 can't ask.

15 The drivers, when they get tired -- they're
16 just not as good of drivers. And I'm wondering to
17 myself if they want to come this way so they don't have
18 to abide by the interstate highway rules of the eight
19 hours, where they have to stop and take a nap. If
20 that's the case, that's even more of a concern to me.

21 I did figure a little bit of -- if they're
22 going to Butte from Thompson Mine, it's, like, 243
23 miles. Now, we don't know if they're going to Butte.
24 If they go through Mackay, it's 344 miles.

25 But I'm saying that from -- almost all the way

1 up to the top, they're going to have a thirty-five to
2 forty-mile-an-hour minimum of how they can -- how fast
3 they can travel, which is going to be about a seven-hour
4 trip.

5 And they can probably average sixty miles an
6 hour if they go south, which is going to be a six-hour
7 trip.

8 So if all they're doing is trying to save some
9 diesel, that's offensive to -- going through, as usual,
10 a small town with few voices, where you're not going to
11 have huge gatherings, where people are going to stop
12 those trucks if they get angry.

13 This is typical of rural America, having not
14 much say in their personal life. And most of us moved
15 here to have quiet and to be -- to feel safe and to be
16 relaxed.

17 It's a terrible idea. Whoever is listening:
18 It's a terrible, terrible idea.

19 So I guess that's about all I've got to say.
20 Thank you for listening.

21 MEGAN STARK: Is that it?

22 MARTHA EDGAR: Yeah.

23 MEGAN STARK: Okay.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: If you think of something
25 else, you're free --

1 (End of audio file.)

2 . . .

3 (Following is a transcription of the audio file
4 labeled z0000004t.)

5 MARY CARROLL: You just want to know how I feel
6 about it; correct?

7 MEGAN STARK: Yes. So state your name and your
8 address, if you can.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: And just relax. We're
10 just going to listen.

11 MEGAN STARK: Yeah. We're --

12 MARY CARROLL: Okay. You're not intimidating.
13 So --

14 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

15 MARY CARROLL: Okay. My name is Mary Carroll.
16 My address is 71 Blythe Lane, Salmon, Idaho, 83467.

17 Okay. My comments are that passing through
18 Salmon will make it necessary to make two very tight
19 turns, because of these very long vehicles -- one at the
20 intersection of Highway 28 and 93 and again at the sharp
21 turn where it turns, where Highway 93 heads north.

22 Vehicles of this length will need both lanes of
23 this two-lane highway. I have had just the normal
24 length force me to wait for them or move over. So it
25 will require other motorists to yield to them during

1 these turns.

2 Also, their inability to stop quickly makes
3 them more dangerous when going through town. These
4 unbelievably long vehicles are horribly dangerous
5 because, in many instances, they are unable to stop in
6 time to avoid serious injuries or sometimes death to
7 other motorists during an emergency.

8 This problem is made even worse in dangerous
9 driving conditions. Additionally, they are very
10 dangerous and difficult to pass on a two-lane highway.

11 Unfortunately, these long vehicles are already
12 allowed to drive on interstate highways in Idaho; but a
13 four-line, divided highway allows options for other
14 motorists to react to any immediate danger to them posed
15 by these dangerous vehicles. They should only use the
16 interstate for transporting their loads.

17 And I will additionally comment that this is a
18 scenic highway. It is quite dangerous between here and
19 Challis. The road curves. It's almost impossible to
20 pass. There are pull-out lanes. These vehicles will be
21 so long that they will probably barely even fit in them.

22 So passing them on a curving road is going to
23 be almost impossible, and they -- in bad weather, rain,
24 snow, they throw up ice and snow. You can see nothing.

25 And you're supposed to be able to go -- to pass

1 these huge, long vehicles with no sight -- no nothing --
2 going in the opposite lane of traffic. I mean, it's
3 unbelievably dangerous. Unbelievably dangerous.

4 And I have experienced, on the interstates,
5 driving with these trucks. And I'm sure most of the
6 drivers are very courteous, and they do follow the speed
7 limits; but a good number of them absolutely do not, and
8 they ride your bumper. They're extremely dangerous.

9 And I will just end by saying I know an
10 individual, a Fish and Game officer, who was driving on
11 the interstate in the Jerome area. There was an
12 accident.

13 All of the motorists and cars were able to
14 stop. One of these big, heavy trucks was unable to
15 stop, crashed into him, killing him instantly.

16 And I watch video after video after video on
17 news programs showing these trucks and the horrible
18 damage.

19 So other than, you know, the destruction and
20 grooving of the highway, which is already pretty grim,
21 it's the danger. It's the danger that I object to in
22 this.

23 It's just outrageous to expect the rest of the
24 motorists to share the highways with these vehicles. So
25 that is my statement.

1 Thank you so much for letting me --

2 MEGAN STARK: Is there anything else you would
3 like to add? You're welcome to come back if you have
4 more later.

5 MARY CARROLL: No. I think I've pretty well
6 covered it. I just want to stress that my main
7 objective here is the danger of these vehicles.

8 So the more roads that are opened up to these
9 vehicles, it just exacerbates the incredible problem. I
10 follow the hay trucks on Highway 93, which are allowed
11 to be those big, long ones.

12 MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

13 MARY CARROLL: I have seen them come around
14 curves too fast. I'm coming the other way. I see that
15 last trailer almost fall over. If it did, it would fall
16 right in front of me.

17 So I just -- it's incomprehensible to me that
18 this would even be considered.

19 MEGAN STARK: Uh-huh.

20 MARY CARROLL: So thank you.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

22 (End of audio file.)

23 . . .

24

25

1 (Following is a transcription of the audio
2 file labeled z0000003.)

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Bob Hoff. Robert Hoff.

4 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: You talked to me on the
5 phone. I'm Priscilla Woodward.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, good. Yeah, you
7 called me.

8 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Yeah.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: That's great. Thank you.

10 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: I will.

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Let me give this back to
12 you.

13 My name is Robert Hoff. I am an Idaho
14 Transportation board member in District Six. I will be
15 the hearing officer of this hearing.

16 With me is the following staff: This is Megan
17 Stark. She's our recorder.

18 To give a statement, please begin by stating
19 your name and your address and who you're representing,
20 other than yourself.

21 Courtesy is expected in the hearing room to
22 minimize or eliminate interference.

23 You don't look like you're too rowdy.

24 This is not a forum for question-and-answer. I
25 don't answer any questions. The hearing officer may ask

1 questions to clarify testimony.

2 An information room is available in there for
3 any questions. We thank you. You're free to leave and
4 come back if you want to --

5 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: No.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: -- add to your testimony.

7 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Okay.

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: So you can start.

9 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Do you want me to start
10 now?

11 MEGAN STARK: Begin by (indiscernible).

12 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: My name is Priscilla
13 Woodward. I am a resident of Salmon, Idaho, 32 Island
14 Farm Road.

15 I am seventy-seven years old, and I'm a good
16 driver. I drive a safe car, and I haven't had an
17 accident in my whole life that was anything more than
18 hitting a deer.

19 I've been to Missoula on medical business,
20 meeting family at the airport, taking them back three
21 times in the last two weeks.

22 And I shudder at the fact of meeting an
23 oversized truck on that pass, because it wasn't built
24 for that. There's not two lanes of traffic anywhere for
25 an extended period of time.

1 And it is now -- it does have a ski resort at
2 the top. We have a huge amount of people who go up
3 there -- teenagers, too -- that go up there every day
4 this ski season. It's full of people.

5 And we have a school bus that goes up there on
6 Fridays when we don't have school. It's full of kids
7 going skiing. It's -- the entire highway is considered
8 by the federal government to be a back-country byway.

9 And then -- so in the summertime, we have lots
10 of tourists, lots of bicycles, lots of motorcycles. And
11 it's not built to accommodate double trailers. None of
12 it is four-lane.

13 There are very few places to pass on the
14 highway. We've had more than one a year -- resident --
15 drive into the highway by -- or into the river and
16 drown, because it doesn't have, of course, barriers
17 between the highway and the river.

18 Many times there's elk or deer or bears -- I've
19 seen all of them -- between here and Challis. I have
20 followed deer down the highway at five miles an hour
21 until they decided they were going to move.

22 I have been a business person a great deal of
23 my life, and I understand the need to economize as much
24 as you can. However, in their wisdom, the engineers
25 built us an interstate highway that goes from this part,

1 that part of the country down there, to Missoula.

2 It's two lanes in both directions the whole
3 way. The curves are built for people to be able to
4 maintain their speed.

5 Interstate highways are safe. I mean, people
6 get mad about them because people drive fast; but it's a
7 whole lot safer than a two-lane road going through
8 mountain passes and going through a very narrow canyon
9 highway, with the inclusion of tourists and wildlife and
10 bicyclists.

11 I think it's a recipe for disaster. I
12 understand that once it's marked as kind of a highway
13 that other types of loads can be carried on it.

14 And I have real concerns about somebody
15 transporting something that, perhaps, would damage the
16 ecology of our river if the truck fell in the river --
17 because one is going to. I mean, it's going to happen;
18 we know that.

19 I am not against progress; but I am against
20 people taking advantage of the fact that we have
21 something here that is precious to us, that is precious
22 to the people who come to share their free time with us,
23 for companies to be able to save few gallons of diesel
24 fuel getting up into Montana.

25 MEGAN STARK: Is that it? Do you have any

1 more?

2 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: I can't -- I mean, I'm
3 sure I'll think of something and hit myself in the head
4 when I get home; but I -- we are -- Salmon is now one of
5 the weigh stations on the Continental Divide. So we
6 have a lot of those hikers that come down, and then they
7 hike down the highway.

8 And it's just never been turned into part of
9 the coming 21st century. We're still very much -- I've
10 had to stop for people herding their cattle down the
11 road, down the highway.

12 You know, you understand. They've got to get
13 from that pasture to this pasture because it's fall, and
14 we understand that sort of thing. You know?

15 But opening the door -- if it were just this
16 company and they were going to do it for six months and
17 it was something that they had to do to stay in
18 business, I think everybody would say, "Okay, that's
19 reasonable."

20 But you're opening the door. A lot of our hay
21 gets shipped to China. If they can put it on a -- if
22 they can drive it up to Missoula and put it on empty
23 containers -- and that's what they put it in is the
24 containers that come over here full and go back empty.
25 So they fill them with hay.

1 The Chinese have decided they like beef, and
2 they don't have any grassland.

3 What's going to be next? You know, is somebody
4 going to open up some kind of a mine that has -- that
5 has a material that will destroy our wild river that
6 we've spend so many millions and millions of dollars
7 trying to protect?

8 I think this is foolishness. And I don't
9 understand how it got this far, that it wasn't just
10 said, "Go drive on the four-lane highway."

11 My very last concern -- and I don't know --
12 because I'm not an engineer -- I asked my son to write a
13 letter, and hopefully he will because -- he's a
14 professional engineer.

15 We were looking at the underpinnings of the
16 road up the pass. Those were built a long time ago,
17 when they didn't have anything anywhere near that heavy,
18 not as heavy as anything that our dump trucks are
19 driving around.

20 And it's not built on solid rock. It's built
21 on platforms, and you can see it in the fall when
22 there's no leaves on the trees. They just redid that
23 entire road last summer.

24 It was in horrible shape, just from the
25 occasional trucks. And they are occasional. Not many

1 trucks come over that hill because it's a long way up
2 and a long way down.

3 As a matter of fact, it's so unimportant as a
4 road that they don't even keep our restroom open in the
5 wintertime up there -- the rest stop.

6 They lock it, which is pretty offensive, since
7 it's a long way from anywhere to anywhere. They don't
8 even have it out. I mean, you know, the forestry
9 service puts out outhouses; and it's locked in the
10 wintertime.

11 And I think that we're going to have a horrible
12 consequence of this and everyone is going to say, "Oh,
13 my God. Why did it ever happen in the first place?"

14 And I don't think it should.

15 MEGAN STARK: Okay.

16 THE HEARING OFFICER: That's good testimony.

17 MEGAN STARK: Very good. Are you happy with
18 that?

19 PRISCILLA WOODWARD: Yeah. I'm fine.

20 MEGAN STARK: Okay.

21 (End of audio file.)

22 . . .
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF IDAHO)
) ss.
County of Ada)

I, LORI A. PULSIFER, a Notary Public in and
for the State of Idaho, do hereby certify:

That said proceedings were taken down by me in
shorthand from the digital recording provided and said
proceedings were thereafter reduced to computer type,
and that the foregoing transcript contains a true and
correct record of said proceedings, all done to the best
of my skill and ability.

I further certify that I have no interest in
the event of the action.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 9th day of
February 2020.

/s/ Lori A. Pulsifer

Lori A. Pulsifer
Notary Public in and
for the State of Idaho
*My commission expires
November 7, 2020